

NOV 09 2005

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated August 16, 2005.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 2-4 as being on rejected claim 1. Furthermore, the Examiner has stated that claims 1-4 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action. Claim 1 has been amended in order to overcome these rejections.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the amended claims clearly and distinctly patentably define over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Leong C. Lei
Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

November 9, 2005